

**Remarks**

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-15, and 17-20 is requested. Claims 5, 9, and 16 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 10-12, 14-15, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,307,048 issued to Sonders. Claims 6, 13, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonders in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,723,911 issued to Glehr.

Sonders shows a vehicle security system for preventing thefts and carjackings. A control module (1) is mounted in a vehicle, and includes a disablement device (17) for disabling and enabling the engine. The module also includes a receiver (25) for receiving signals from a remote controller (3). Operation of the remote controller by a user can cause disablement of the vehicle by the control module in the event of a carjacking. Glehr is also directed to a vehicle security system. In this patent, a transceiver in the control unit (2) mounted in the vehicle allows two-way communication with a portable transceiver (3) carried by the user.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not fully appreciated the differences between the claimed invention and the above-cited references.


Claim 1 of the present application is directed to a combination of an "alarm system" (11) with circuitry for wireless communication, and at least one "appliance" (10) which also has circuitry for wireless communication and circuitry for disabling the appliance in response to a signal from the alarm system. The terms in quotations carry their normal dictionary definitions. That is, an "alarm system" is one that warns or alerts, and an "appliance" is a household or office device operated by gas or electrical current. (See, e.g., Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (Merriam-Webster 1990). Both Sonders and Glehr are directed to motor vehicles, not appliances as that term is generally understood. Further, any alarm system as that term is understood is mounted in the vehicle, and the only wireless communication is between that alarm system and a remote control unit (3 of Sonders or Glehr). Thus, there is no wireless communication between an alarm system and an appliance as required by claim 1. Rather, Sonders and Glehr have a system where they can operate the alarm by remote control, but do not teach an alarm system which can wirelessly communicate with an appliance to disable it.

Similarly, claim 7 of the present application is directed to an alarm system which is adapted to provide a wireless signal to an appliance which disables the appliance, and claim 14 of the present application is directed to an appliance which includes wireless communication with an alarm system and circuitry for disabling the appliance in response to a signal from the alarm system. As stated above, neither Sonders nor Glehr teaches any such appliance or alarm system.

It is therefore submitted that the subject matter of claims 1, 7, and 14 are neither taught nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Since the remainder of the claims are dependent on one of claims 1, 7, or 14, they should also be allowable without the need for further discussion.

Passage to issue is requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lester H. Birnbaum", written over a horizontal line.

Lester H. Birnbaum  
Reg. No. 25830  
Attorney for Applicants  
610-530-9166

Dated: 5/8/06